

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9-27 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12-17 and 20-23 have been amended, new claims 24-27 have been added and claims 2, 5 and 8 have been canceled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding office action, the drawings, specification and claims were objected to; claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Faigon et al; claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Anger et al in view of Faigon et al; claims 9-23 were allowed; and claims 4, 6 and 7 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

The drawings, specification and claims have been amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding office action. Claim 8 has also been canceled regarding the objections of this claim as being duplicative. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the objections to the drawings, specifications and claims be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Faigon et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In item 11 regarding the Statement of Reasons for Allowance, the office action indicates that claim 1 does not clearly determine whether the fields are defined in the MIB for an object or if they are just arbitrarily defined anywhere in the system, and notes that

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004

Reply to Office Action dated May 10, 2004

Faigon et al teaches fields that are defined outside of the MIB. It is respectfully noted that claim 1 now clearly recites that the TrapFlag field and the TrapPeer field are defined in the MIB. This feature supported in this specification at least at page 8, lines 4-10.

Further, the office action also indicates that claim 1 does not clearly define what the TrapFlag and TrapPeer fields are or what they do. However, it is respectfully noted that amended claim 1 clearly defines these fields. In particular, amended claim 1 recites that a value of the TrapFlag field is set by the manager to indicate whether or not the agent should issue a Trap message for the corresponding object, and a value of the TrapPeer field is set by the agent to indicate whether or not the trap operation condition is satisfied.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claim 1 each of the claims pending patentably define over Faigon et al.

Similar arguments apply to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Anger et al in view of Faigon et al. That is, Anger et al. also does not teach or suggest a TrapFlag field or a TrapPeer field as defined by the claimed invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection also be withdrawn.

In addition, new claims 24-27 have been added to set forth the invention in a varying scope, and applicants submit the new claims are supported by the originally filed application. In particular, new claims 24-27 are directed to a SNMP management system. It is respectfully submitted new claims 24-27 are also allowable for similar reasons as discussed above.

Amdt. dated September 1, 2004


Reply to Office Action dated May 10, 2004

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
David A. Bilodeau, Esq.
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/DAB:knv

Date: September 1, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610



FIG. 1
BACKGROUND ART




FIG. 2

